

City of Happy Valley
Design Review Board
Work Session Minutes
Monday, October 22, 2012

Board Members Present:

Board Member, Tarnovsky
Board Member, Grady

Chair, Higgins – Absent
Vice Chair, Tiley – Absent
Board Member, Walton – Absent
Board Member, Nelson - Absent
Board Member, Leone - Absent

Staff Members Present:

Michael Walter, Economic &
Community Development Director
Cheryl Whitehead, Planning Assistant

Others Present:

(See attached sign-in sheet)

CALL TO ORDER

The work session began at 7:05 p.m.

Michael Walter, Economic & Community Development Director, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made.

HAPPY VALLEY STYLE CODE AMENDMENT

Kathy Corliss, Angelo Planning Group and Oliver Kunie, HDR Group, gave the following presentation:

- The goal tonight is to settle on one option for each new concept
- Received written comments from Richard Higgins and will include them with the changes
- The changes are a combination of the happy valley style and the appendix B
- Tried to be flexible enough for various styles but still remain true and consistent to the look of the happy valley style
- Need to tighten up some of the design items
- Oliver stated that another option is to do nothing if the board feels that the code is fine the way it currently is
- Disproportionate Building Elements
 - Option 1 – require windows in vertical elements
 - Option 2 – Delete minimum height requirement of public street corners
 - Option 3 – Replace the absolute height requirement of 34ft with a relative height requirement
 - These items may be mixed and matched together

- Discussed several options decided on support of combination of both Option 1 and Option 3 with a 5ft separation
- Overly Busy Facades
 - Option B.1 – Add language to the standards reinforcing a harmonious and cohesive overall building design
 - Option B.2 – Add requirement to utilize elements and materials in a way that ties separate parts of a building together
 - Option B.1 would strengthen the code language
 - Board Member Grady asked if the City will pursue the 3 styles presently in the ordinance
 - Michael Walter stated that Option B.2 will be better at working towards the City style and is something that can be supported by all of the other boards
 - Option B.2 requires that building materials be repeated – it depends on how defined the City wants to be
 - Even if we provide prescriptive standards they will still need to have some flexible options so that the applicant can work with them
 - Could include more pictures of what is required
 - Specific amounts/percentages for materials would need to be defined if the prescriptive option is used
 - Another option is to be more specific within the appendix
 - Could the word “preferred” be changed regarding the 3 current styles – preferred means that it is not required
 - Board Member Tarnovsky stated that she doesn’t agree - that it is better to have different preferred options and not so prescriptive so that everything doesn’t look the same
 - Board Member Grady stated that he would like to have various options from all three styles
 - Board Member Tarnovsky stated that this is a discussion that needs to be done when the entire board is present
 - Will work towards more of Option B.1
- Roof Forms
 - How can flat roofs be incorporated
 - The City of Sandy added a preferred pitch roof or the other option is parapet
 - City of Sandy code is under 50ft or less have to do a gable or hipped roofline with the roof length defining the number of gables
 - City of Sandy has a very detailed code with results turning out very well but can be challenging on some buildings
 - Discussed various roof options and Sandy’s roof line code
 - City of Sandy has taken the Option C.2 approach
 - Roof line issues have been a very key and big issue in the past
 - Michael Walter stated that the City has zones that were built around areas zoned for large building like Fred Meyer
 - We don’t have to mirror Sandy’s code – our goals aren’t necessarily what theirs are
 - Would like to give the perception of a slope roof for large buildings
 - Board Member Tarnovsky is concerned about defining too much or requiring too much which will define the style of the building for the applicant
 - Could have separate requirements for small, midsize and large buildings
 - Would like to have Option C.2 but require 40ft instead of 50ft
- Foundation Walls
 - Option D.1 – Establish more prescriptive standards foundation walls
 - Option D.2 – Establish provisions for sloped sites
 - Need to avoid corrugated and board form so to get away from the plain look

- Discussed various concrete options
 - If we remove the decorative cast concrete sentence then would be OK with this option
 - OK if the concrete wall is plain if it is hidden by landscape but the landscape must be tall enough at the time of planting to hide the wall
- Two Track System
 - Is the exception process working and do you like it
 - Two options – could follow the City of Tigard’s model for their downtown area or rely more heavily on the design appendix B manual
 - If there was an exception the issues would need to be addressed within the design appendix B
 - The concern is that the design appendix B is not written at this time in a way that would support this option - would need to update the appendix B
 - Not sure if this would give enough guidance for staff
 - Michael Walter stated that the problem with Tigard is that applicants make dubious arguments as to the character of their proposal
 - If the process is working then the more perspective the code is then the more exceptions staff will have
 - Sounds like the current exceptions process is working but thought it might be nice to strengthen it and tie it to the appendix by Option E.2
- Will incorporate the comments of Chair Higgins and the two Board Members into the current code and bring it back when we have a quorum
- Don’t feel that we need to backtrack due to lack of attendance – will start forward from here
- Staff will investigate whether there are funds in the budget to allow for some drafts of what the buildings would look like using the new standards
- A recap was given of what was discussed and decided on tonight – Will come back with the updates and illustrations, if applicable
- Board member Grady asked about the wording “ Preferred”
 - The current three styles are only in the appendix and not in the code – they show where the style came from and are not required
 - Would have to make a new section stating that these are required
 - It would be worth adding a paragraph to endorse this so that the elements of the three styles are required

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Prepared and submitted by:

Cheryl Whitehead
Planning Assistant

These minutes were approved at the January 7, 2013 Design Review Board.